



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

POLICE METHODS IN LONDON.

BY JOSIAH FLYNT.

SIXTY-ODD years ago there was born to a clergyman in England a son, who in course of time elected to try his fortune in India. Some years after the birth of the son, there was born to a tigress in the wilds of India a youngster which waxed strong and big. Events so shaped themselves that when the clergyman's son had grown to man's estate, and the tiger had been taught to manage for himself, the two had a meeting. The Englishman went forth on a hunting trip; on the same day the tiger decided to prowl and see what he could devour. The tiger discovered the Englishman, and springing upon him, felled him to the ground. In falling, the Englishman came down on his right side. Remembering a story, heard years before, that so long as a man will keep quiet and does not move, there are chances that an attacking tiger will refrain from further attack, he lay perfectly still. The tiger however, began to gnaw at the man's left arm. The pain was intense, and there was nothing to prove that his legs would not be nibbled off next, but the Englishman continued to lie still—and hope. Pretty soon he heard the voices of a rescuing party. The tiger heard them also. The rescuing party arrived, and the tiger was slain. The Englishman got back to civilization *minus* his left arm. To-day he is known as Sir Edward Bradford, Commissioner of London's Metropolitan Police. He sits in his office at Scotland Yard, and with his brains and his right arm makes plain to the 16,000 officers and constables how he wants London protected.

A few months ago, while visiting certain European capitals for the purpose of gathering information about foreign police organizations, it was my good fortune to make the acquaintance of the man whom the tiger had intended to make away with. I

found him seated at his desk busy in the perusal of reports. He does not look like a Chief of Police. He is a small man, hardly five feet four, I should say, and gives one the impression of having devoted himself to the art of politeness rather than to the profession of governing a police department. There is not the slightest trace of bluster or "almightiness" in his attitude toward callers. Except that he was at Scotland Yard and seated at the Commissioner's desk, he might easily have passed for a country gentleman painstakingly looking over his business papers. Yet he was for years connected with the Secret Department in the India Office, and probably knows as much about the police business as any man identified with it.

He asked me whether, previous to calling on him, I had looked over the "Criminal Statistics Report" from the Home Office; he indicated that I could probably find there the bulk of the information desired. I told him that I was anxious to see what kind of men the detective department employed, and asked him whether it would be permissible for me to accompany some of the plain-clothes men while on duty.

"In the main the men in the Criminal Investigation Department come from the same class of society as that which supplies us with constables," the Commissioner replied. "Furthermore, I have done away with the practice of letting the police serve as guides to slumming parties. I found when I took hold here, that the police were practically keeping certain places open in order to have something ready and handy to show to strangers. There is nothing to hinder you from having a look by yourself, however. I go about the town and see things for myself, and you can do the same."

"Are ex-thieves ever employed 'on the force?'" I asked. Sir Edward gave me an astonished look, and then exclaimed: "Never." I hinted that the custom was not unknown in the United States. "Of course, our men have various ways of collecting facts," Sir Edward proceeded, "and it is not impossible"—here he smiled—"that they make use of certain persons whom it is not necessary to name; but as for giving ex-thieves positions in the organization, such a thing never happens."

I was then turned over to Assistant-Commissioner E. R. Henry, the head of the Criminal Investigation Department, and my study of London police methods was continued for about eight weeks.

I.

Speaking roughly, there are from six to eight million men, women, and children who live within the jurisdiction of the two police organizations which look out for personal safety and private and public property in the British Metropolis. The majority of these people are probably natives of Great Britain, but scattered among them are thousands of foreigners who have come from the uttermost parts of the earth. The mass of the inhabitants are law-observing citizens who not only make every effort not to break the law themselves, but who also take a friendly interest in helping the police to carry out their orders. Londoners are gifted with a wonderful good-humor, as well as with an enviable willingness to assist in making the machinery of government run with as little friction as possible. In spite of this good-humor and friendly intention on the part of the population, however, it requires 15,977 policemen in one organization, and 1,056 in the other, to keep the public peace. The larger force is called The Police of the Metropolis, or, more generally, The Metropolitan Police. The smaller organization is called The City Police; the latter are on duty exclusively in the district known as "The City." The Metropolitan Police are responsible to the Home Office—which corresponds to our Department of the Interior. Their jurisdiction extends over a radius of fifteen miles from Charing Cross (exclusive of the City of London), and embraces an area of 688 square miles. The jurisdiction of the City Police comprises an area of 671 acres. Although this district is small, the amount of property to be protected is enormous, and there are well on toward 40,000 night residents whose safety has to be considered. In the daytime, there are hundreds of thousands of persons who either find their employment in the City or come and go through its streets, and these people also fall within the purview of the local police force. The organization is maintained by the Corporation of the City of London. It is commanded by a Commissioner and an Assistant Commissioner, subject to the general direction of a Police Committee elected by the Common Council.

Previous to the early part of the last century the police arrangements of London were worse, probably, than any to be found at present in the United States. Throughout England, in fact, both the country and town police organizations, if they could be called

such, were in such a loose state, that the Government imposed the severest sentences for comparatively trivial offences, in the hope of thus being able to scare offenders. There had been Ecclesiastical, Forest, Commercial, and nearly every other imaginable kind of police in England at one time and another; but the beginning of the nineteenth century found London practically at the mercy of bands of thieves and marauders, which the existing guardians of the peace were utterly unequal to cope with. Captain Melville, in his recently published "*History of Police in England*," has this to say regarding the conditions which prevailed in London at that time:

"The state of the metropolis was such that social reformers might well have despaired of ever seeing an improvement; every corrupting influence and every criminal tendency seemed to flourish unchecked and unrebuked in the congenial atmosphere of the London slums. Thieves and receivers, drivers of hackney coaches, and sometimes toll-gate keepers, conspired together to rob the travelling public. Still more serious were the conspiracies in which solicitors and police officers were concerned, which had for their object the levying of blackmail from bankers and others. In this organized system of fraud the following method was usually adopted: A man of education, with money behind him, would plan a bank robbery, purchase the necessary information, and hire expert thieves to do the actual work. The robbery having been duly effected, some time would be allowed to elapse; and then the prime mover in the affair, through his agent the police officer, would notify the manager of the bank that the stolen notes or securities had been traced, and might be recovered, if a large reward was forthcoming. The offer was invariably coupled with the proviso that, in the event of the proposed restitution being carried out, no further questions should be asked, nor further proceedings taken. Between 1805 and 1818 there were more than two hundred executions for forgery alone—that is to say, at the rate of one execution in every three weeks. When one considers that only a few of the forgers were caught, that of these not all were convicted, and that of the convicted but a moderate percentage were hanged, we get some idea of the prevalence of this particular offence. On the whole, there is no exaggeration in saying that, at the dawn of the nineteenth century, England was passing through an epoch of criminality darker than any other in her annals. In 1815 alone, eighty thousand pounds was given in blood-money, an expenditure that might almost be considered as a Government subsidy for the encouragement of felony. Forty pounds was the reward offered for the conviction of certain offenders, and it was obviously to the advantage of the thief-taker not to interfere with a promising young criminal until he should commit a forty pounds crime; premature conviction was tantamount to killing the goose that should lay the golden egg, and the common cant phrase of the

day, when referring to a juvenile offender, was, 'he doesn't weigh forty pounds yet.'"

Among other writers and reformers who labored toward a regeneration of the police was Henry Fielding. He and his brother, together with another writer by the name of Colquhoun, published pamphlets and books describing the terrible state of crime in the Metropolis, and suggesting reforms and remedies by which the conditions could be changed. As happens in all reforms, these men wrote and preached and agitated ahead of their time; but the seed sown by them bore fruit in 1829, when Sir Robert Peel succeeded in getting through Parliament a bill by which the different parish and ward police forces were organized into one force.

Captain Melville says:

"By June, 1830, the Metropolitan Police consisted of 17 superintendents, 68 inspectors, 323 sergeants, and 2,906 constables, or 3,314 of all ranks. The Metropolitan Police District was divided into seventeen Police Divisions. These divisions were then divided into Sub-Divisions, Sections and Beats. There were eight Sections in a Division, and eight Beats in a Section. . . . At first, the twenty-four hours were divided into two day reliefs and two night reliefs, half of the entire force being on duty by day and half by night. This arrangement was not a success, and was subsequently altered, when the day duty was performed in two reliefs and the night duty in one relief. . . . The immediate result of the institution of an effective police force, whose main object was prevention, was precisely that which was to be expected: convictions for crimes of violence decreased, because evil-disposed persons knew that they could no longer commit them with impunity, and convictions for minor offences increased, because the vigilance of the new policemen brought to their proper punishment many a petty depredator who had easily hoodwinked his familiar friend, the old parish officer."

The Commissioner of the new force was selected and appointed by the Imperial Government, as is the case to-day.

The City Police also received an overhauling at about the same time that the Metropolitan force was organized. It had degenerated to nearly as low depths as had the old parish organizations, and the City would doubtless have been deprived of its ancient right to have a police force of its own, had it not followed the Government's example and reorganized its police department. To-day this department compares very favorably with the larger force, and there is no indication that the City is to lose the privilege of policing its own immediate district.

As the Metropolitan Police are the dominating organization, they will be exclusively considered in what follows.

II.

The present Metropolitan Police are divided into twenty-two "divisions," the division corresponding more or less to what are called precincts in New York. On the coat-collar of every uniformed member of the force are an embroidered letter of the alphabet and a number. The letter indicates the division to which the man is assigned, and the number is his name, so to speak. In the Police Courts, the constable, when called upon by the magistrate to give his testimony concerning an arrest, calls his letter and number before telling what he knows about the case in hand. All told, there are 13,373 constables in the metropolitan area. During 1901 they were officered by 32 superintendents, 573 inspectors, and 1,999 sergeants. The number of men available for police duty during the same period was 14,082.

The superior officers of the organization are as follows:

Title.	Salary.
Commissioner	£2,100
Assistant Commissioners (3)	1,250
Chief Clerk	750
Surgeon-in-Chief	600
Clerk of Accounts	600

Besides these officials there are also a Receiver, who attends to the financial department, clerks of the first and second class, assistant clerks, solicitors to the Commissioner, Superintendent of the Executive and Statistical Branch, Superintendents of the Criminal Investigation Department, and also a Superintendent of the public-carriage branch and the lost-property office. The pay of the force, including Superintendents, Inspectors, Sergeants, and Constables, during the year 1900, was, £1,293,952 13s.—or considerably over six million dollars. The police bill is paid out of what are called the "rates." The total amount of police rate levied for the year ended March 31st, 1901, was £910,305 10s. 9d., and the Local Taxation Account (including £4,389 14s. 8d. under the Agricultural Rates Act, 1896) contributed £724,964 19s. 8d. to the police fund during the year.

The area of the different divisions, or precincts, varies very considerably. That of Whitehall, for instance, contains only 1.82 square miles, while the Clapham division takes in over 76. Each

division has a Superintendent, to whom are assigned the number of Inspectors, Sergeants, and Constables which the Commissioner thinks necessary to meet the needs of his district. Hammersmith, for example, with an area of 73.42 square miles, has a Superintendent, 18 Inspectors, 124 Sergeants, and 726 Constables. Whitechapel, on the other hand, with an area of only 2.08 square miles, has, besides its Superintendent, 25 Inspectors, 57 Sergeants, and 488 Constables.

The pay of the men up to the inspectors is considerably below that received by the New York Police:

	Minimum, Per annum. £ s. d.	Rising by, Per annum. £ s. d.	Maximum, Per annum. £ s. d.
Inspectors	153 18 7	5 4 0	174 16 0
	Per week. £ s. d.	Per week, Per annum. £ s. d.	Per week. £ s. d.
Station Sergeants	2 7 6	0 1 0	2 10 6
Sergeants	1 16 0	0 1 0	2 2 0
Constables	1 5 6	0 1 0	1 13 6

NOTE.—These rates were fixed in December, 1900.

From this table it will be seen that the constable, as long as he remains in this grade, can never earn more than eight dollars and a fraction a week. This maximum is reached after eight years' service. About eight pence a week are deducted from his salary for superannuation. Retirement, without a medical certificate, is permissible on completion of 25 years' service. The pension received after 15 years' service amounts to one-fourth of the salary drawn at the time of retirement. After 35 years' service the pension given is two-thirds of the salary. In addition to their salaries, married constables receive a weekly lodging allowance of eighteen pence. There are also allowances for clothes. Sergeants, Inspectors, and the other grades of officers pay somewhat more for superannuation than does the constable, but in no case can the deduction from their salaries for this purpose exceed two and a half per cent. The pensions are intended for the men only; their widows and children do not benefit by them.

There are three classes of Inspectors in London—Chief Inspectors, Divisional Inspectors, and ordinary Inspectors. It is the duty of all these men, as their title implies, to see that the subordinates placed under their direction do the work to which they have been assigned. A patrol Inspector, for instance, has about 26 sergeants and constables to look after. He must see that the

patrol sergeants are in their right "sections," that the constables stick to their respective "beats," and he must be in a position to give a satisfactory account of his own performance of duty whenever called upon to do so. The superintendent of the division is responsible to Scotland Yard for the condition of his district. The beats of the constables are changed every month. Those who are not married, and can be accommodated at the station houses, of which each division has one, pay about a dollar a week for lodging. They are generally allowed to get their meals where they wish, but the married men generally arrange to take at least two meals with their families. The patrol duty of the constable is from eight to twelve hours according to circumstances. Four months of the year he is compelled to go on the night relief.

The Criminal Investigation Department of the London Police is a distinct institution by itself. It comes under the general management of the Commissioner, but an Assistant Commissioner is the real head of the department. It is a popular notion that the term "Scotland Yard" corresponds to what is called the Detective Bureau in New York. This is an erroneous impression. Scotland Yard is the headquarters, or the Central Office, of the entire police force, and what the Londoners call the Criminal Investigation Department corresponds to the American Detective Bureau. At headquarters proper, there are a number of picked men who devote themselves exclusively to ferreting out serious crime. Besides this "flying squadron," if it may be called such, each separate division also has its plain-clothes men—in New York they are called precinct men—who are under the general direction, however, of the superior officers of the Investigation Department at headquarters. Besides the Assistant Commissioner, who is the chief, there is a superintendent, as in the case of the divisions, and there are also inspectors. The plain-clothes men, both at headquarters and in the divisions, receive somewhat higher pay than do the uniformed policemen. They are recruited mainly from those members of the uniformed force who have shown themselves particularly adapted for secret investigations.

Before I was allowed to go upstairs at Scotland Yard and make the personal acquaintance of some of the operatives in the Investigation Department, the Assistant Commissioner cautioned me under no circumstances to mention the names of operatives

whom I might meet. "We are very hard on men," he said, "whom we suspect of looking for notoriety, and we do not like to see their names in the papers when they can be kept out. We are not seeking any advertisement whatsoever. You have come to us properly accredited, and I shall be glad to show you what you want to see, but I trust that you will be very careful not to talk unnecessarily about your experience."

The most interesting feature of this visit "upstairs," was the opportunity afforded me of studying the system in vogue there of taking finger impressions of criminals. The Bertillon system has been practically given up, finger prints taking its place. The old system was discarded, according to Mr. E. R. Henry, the Assistant-Commissioner, and the author of a very practical text-book* on finger impressions, written for the benefit of policemen, because it was too fallible. Mr. Henry was formerly Inspector-General of Police of the Lower Provinces in India, and while filling this post he experimented with finger impressions until he was convinced that, as compared with the Bertillon system of measurements, it was far superior as a means of identifying criminals. About eighteen months ago, the Home Office, on the recommendation of a Commission, appointed to study the matter and present a report, decided to substitute finger prints for the old system, and the results so far achieved have amply justified the change. In order that the reader may more fully appreciate the reasons for the change, I give here some extracts from Mr. Henry's book, which show why a similar innovation in India was deemed practicable.

Anthropometry.

"(1) Instruments are costly and likely to get out of order.

"(2) Measurers must be put through a special course of instruction, and be possessed of sufficient education to understand the significance of the figures of the decimal scale.

"(3) If measurements are inaccurately taken, or accurately taken but wrongly read off or wrongly transcribed, the error cannot afterwards be discovered and remedied in the office where the cards are permanently kept, and this error will persist and defeat all chance

Identification by Finger Prints.

"(1) Accessories needed, a piece of tin and some printer's ink, are inexpensive and procurable everywhere.

"(2) Any person, whether educated or not, after half an hour's practice, can take legible finger prints.

"(3) Finger prints are absolute impressions taken from the body itself under conditions which eliminate error as regards transcription or recording. An effective device is adopted to guard against their being imprinted in a wrong sequence. After the 'rolled' impres-

* "Classification and Uses of Finger Prints."

Anthropometry.

of successful search. If the data recorded are incorrect, no amount of care can afterwards remedy the defect.

"(5) A margin greater or less, must always be allowed for errors on the part of the operator, for what may be termed the 'personal equation' error of operators.

"(6) Search is made according to the somewhat complicated limits and subsidiary limits in a figured 'key,' the details of which even practised searchers could not be trusted to commit to memory."

Identification by Finger Prints.

sion of each digit is taken separately, the digits are confined together in a metal guard and impressed simultaneously as 'plain' impressions, thereby securing their occurrence in a correct sequence, and these 'plain' impressions are compared with the 'rolled' impressions at the time of classification. They may get incorrectly classified, but this error will be subsequently rectified, as it must be noticed during some subsequent search.

"(5) No allowance for error on the part of the operator is made or needed. Working results in India show that, in 1898, 500 anthropometric references necessitated 4,623 pigeon-holes being searched, whereas finger impression references in 1899 necessitated only 707 pigeon-holes being searched.

"(6) No key is required. The searcher decides whether the impression of each digit, the digits being arranged in five pairs, is a Whorl, or not a Whorl. If it is a Whorl, he gives it a prescribed numerical value according as it occurs in the first, or second, or third, or fourth, or fifth pair, and the sum of such values gives a result fixing the particular pigeon hole, out of 1,024, where the card should be placed. The secondary or sub-classification is done equally rapidly and without a key."

Sir Francis Galton has estimated that not one finger impression out of sixty-four billion is likely to resemble any other, a finding which certainly shuts out the probability of confusing resemblances.

In order to show me how quickly a set of impressions could be located in the general file, one of the operators was sent out of the room, and two sets of impressions were taken of my ten fingers. One set was placed in its proper file in the general collection, the man was recalled, handed the set which corresponded with the one in the file, and told to find the duplicate. He produced it in less than two minutes.

During a conversation with one of the Inspectors, reference was made to the so-called "American invasion" of England by New York and other American thieves, which took place some years

ago. One of the main instigators of this importation of American criminal "talent" into Great Britain was Adam Worth, the alleged thief of the Gainsborough picture which went back to London not so very long since. I had known for some time one of the members of this gang, and I was anxious to learn what Scotland Yard had thought of them. The Inspector spoke of them as follows:

"They were one of the smartest sets of thieves this country has ever had to deal with. They fooled us for years, and I am not sure that we should ever have got on to them if luck hadn't helped us out some. We had not been used to that kind of criminal. The men you refer to came over here, put on dress suits, lived at swell hotels, and gave the general appearance of being gentlemen of leisure. We had not had many dealings with thieves in dress suits. It was also a new one on us to find them strolling unconcernedly around hotel corridors. One evening I happened in at the Café Monaco, and whom should I see sitting there, big as life, but Billy Porter and the rest of the mob. That was the kind of surprise that we were continually running up against. Of course we eventually succeeded in landing a number of the gang, but it took a long time; and, as I said, luck had a good deal to do with it. They taught us a good lesson which we are not likely to forget."

Before leaving this section of my article, it seems appropriate to refer to the Report which the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police recently made to the Home Secretary. He presents one every year, and it is later handed to both Houses of Parliament by order of the King. Those which I have been able to see are models which American Police Commissioners would do well to study. According to the Report for 1901, there was an increase of 838 in criminal offences, occurring principally under the heads of house-breaking, burglary, forgery and larceny. Felonies relating to property increased from 16,665 in 1900 to 17,433 in the year under report, this being the largest number registered since 1895, and representing an incidence per thousand of population of .261. There was also a very noticeable rise in the amount of loss in respect of these offences, the total reaching the sum of £376,206, an excess of £163,866 over the loss recorded in 1900. Recoveries, however, were on a similarly large scale, the total value of the property restored being £142,490, as compared with £39,178 in the preceding year. Twenty-four cases of murder were reported; in 16 of these the accused were brought before the Courts. In 6, the murderers committed suicide; in one, the mur-

derers escaped to Italy, but were afterwards brought to book; and in the remaining case the Attorney-General decided not to proceed against the alleged offender. In the 16 cases in which arrests were made, the death sentence was passed in five; in nine the accused were found to be of unsound mind.

So much for the organization of London's Metropolitan Police. Watching thieves and keeping street traffic in order, however, constitute only a part of the London "Bobby's" strenuous life. He must also be a peace-maker when quarrels are in sight, a guardian of women and children who wander into his bailiwick, a protection to drunkards who are unable to care for themselves, and a vigilant caretaker of houses the occupants of which are temporarily out of town.

There is no Pinkerton Agency to supplement police work. There are private detective forces, to be sure, but the public relies on Scotland Yard rather than on outside assistance for the safeguarding of its property and its own personal welfare.

III.

The most striking facts, from the American point of view, concerning the Metropolitan Police of London are, (1) that the force is composed mainly of honest and conscientious men, (2) that politics is not allowed to play any part in the management and direction of the organization, (3) that the Londoners receive, in exchange for the taxes levied for the support of the force, a protection of life and property which makes London one of the safest cities in the world. The most striking difference between the London Police and police forces in the United States, as regards management, is that the former is an Imperial force. The Royal Irish Constabulary and the Metropolitan Police of Dublin are also Imperial organizations.

So far there has been practically no agitation in the United States which has favored control of the police of the country by the National Government. The prevailing sentiment is that each town and hamlet should manage its own police, not even the State being allowed to exercise any direct control in the immediate management of the different police departments within its jurisdiction. One of the results of this system has been that there are almost as many different kinds of police in this country as there are States. Pennsylvania, for instance, chooses the police

government which the politicians and local "statesmen" see fit to offer the tax-payers, and New York is more or less in the same position. To attempt to describe the different police methods in vogue in the United States would take a bulky volume. In many instances, so many men are responsible for the direction of the policemen, that the public has difficulty in finding the parties upon whom the blame should rest for work poorly done. Although the Londoners are not permitted to manage their police department, they at least have it in their power to call to order very quickly the one man in the nation who is responsible for its direction. Any member of Parliament has a right to ask the Home Secretary to explain why he has allowed certain things to happen, and he is not permitted to squirm out of a direct reply by the tiresome rejoinder: "For the good of the Service." He must have a very valid reason for all of his orders and instructions, and the city as well as the nation sees to it that the money expended buys the best performance of duty that the country can produce.

Concerning police corruption in London, there is very little that I have to report. I failed to find any corruption which could be compared with the blackmailing system for which the New York Police have so long been notorious. There are scattered disorderly houses and gambling dens in London, but they do not exist on account of police connivance, and they are raided by the police authorities whenever located. It is not necessary for a busy District Attorney to leave his office and collect his own evidence. The Police collect it for him. When a gambling den is suspected, clever men are told to watch it until there can be no doubt that illegal gaming is going on. Then the raid takes place, the guilty parties are brought into court, and the magistrate or judge gives them their punishment with very little delay. Appeals are seldom granted, and the Londoners are spared the disgusting postponements and legal subterfuges by which so many guilty gamblers escape imprisonment in the United States. Richard Canfield and his alleged gaming house could not exist a week in London, if it be true that his "dive" was run as openly as has been stated. The place would not only be raided, but Canfield would go to prison. Such a place might be able to run secretly for a while, but it would have to enjoy great luck to keep open for many weeks.

The closing-hour question is also very much simplified in London—in fact, in England generally. At one half-hour after midnight on week days—except Saturday, when they close at midnight sharp—and at eleven o'clock on Sundays, the public houses shut their doors. On Sundays, the saloons are open from one o'clock in the afternoon until three, and from six o'clock in the evening until eleven. The public makes no attempt to break through these rules.* Five minutes before closing time, the bar-tenders notify all guests to get ready to leave, and those who linger are forcibly shown their way to the street. Publicans, who are found breaking the law lose their licenses, and are put out of business. This is the whip-lash which the police have over all public houses. A similar procedure in New York might have equally beneficial results, if the police would be honest, and see to it that evidence against offenders was carefully collected and presented.

A word in conclusion concerning the constables and politics. In Philadelphia, where I made an investigation some time ago, I was told by a "grafter" that every policeman in the city was expected to be "good" for at least six votes on election days. In New York it is a notorious fact that superior officers, as well as patrolmen, have taken a very active part in electioneering. In London, when a policeman is caught electioneering, or in any way making use of his office for political purposes, he is discharged from the force *instantly*. There are rumors which would seem to indicate that this rule is not followed in certain other towns in England having municipal organizations; but it is rigidly followed in London. That "Bobby" who is moved to take a hand in affairs which do not concern him as an Imperial police officer, ceases to be a "Bobby" from the moment that his interference in outside matters is discovered.

JOSIAH FLYNT.

* "Clubs," which are practically "booze pens," exist in London, and may be entered on Sunday; but the new Licensing Act, which went into effect January 1, 1903, is bound to diminish their number.